THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI. OCTOBER, 1926. No. 10.

Some Historical Facts Concerning Church Polity.

P. E. KRETZMANN, St. Louis, Mo.

1. Church Organization and Government in the Early Christian Church.

The church government of the early Christian Church was very simple. There was no need of elaborate constitutions, canons, rules of discipline, and the like, which are now considered so essential in many church-bodies. The word, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," Matt. 23, 8, was sufficient for all purposes. In the scheme of government and discipline which Christ had designed for His Church, simplicity was to be the prime factor in obtaining and maintaining efficiency. He wanted to be the sole Head and Director of all the affairs of the congregation, and within the congregation there should be no distinction as to greater and smaller before Him; all should be equal.

This truth is in no way jeopardized by the fact that Christ Himself chose a certain number of men as His servants, or apostles, by immediate call. "The apostles were the special messengers of Christ, chosen and called and commissioned directly and immediately by the Master whom they were to serve as His missionaries to the nations." (*Theol. Quarterly,* VII, 18.) The direct, or immediate, call is described Matt. 10, 2; Mark 6, 7; Luke 10, 2. In accordance with this call the men who received it designate themselves as apostles of Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. 1, 1; 2, 1; Jas. 1, 1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1; Jude 1; Gal. 2, 9. Matthias was chosen by lot under the immediate guidance of God. Acts 1, 23—26. And as for Paul, he emphasizes no point more strongly than this, that he was selected by Christ for the work of his apostleship. Acts 9, 15; Rom. 1, 1; 1 Cor. 1, 1; 9, 1. 2; 2 Cor. 1, 1; 11, 1—12, 9; Gal. 1, 1; Eph. 1, 1 ; 3, 7. 8; Col. 1, 1; 1 Tim. 1, 1. 2. 7; 2 Tim. 1, 1; Titus 1, 1. These apostles of Christ were divinely inspired in the capacity of teachers of all men. John 14, 26; 15, 26. 27;

Acts 1, 8; 2, 42; 8, 14; 1 Cor. 4, 1. 6. 9; Gal. 1, 12; 1 Cor. 11, 23; 2 Cor. 5, 20; Eph. 2, 20; 3, 5. In order that their preaching might not lack the necessary impressiveness and power, but be received by men on account of supernatural proofs and manifestations, they were endowed with special gifts from on high. Acts 2, 3. 4; 3, 1—11; 9, 32—42; 13, 10. 11; 14, 8—10; 19, 6. 11; 20, 10.

In spite of all these gifts and graces, however, the apostles did not presume upon any authority beyond that of the Word as ambassadors of Christ. Acts 5, 1—11; 2 Cor. 3, 6—10; Philemon 8. They speak of their work as the ministry, *διακονία*, of the saints. Acts 1, 17. 25. They expressly state that they have no dominion over the faith of the Christians, but are helpers of their joy. 2 Cor. 1, 24. St. Paul speaks to the Corinthians not by commandment, but to prove the sincerity of their love. 2 Cor. 8, 8. There is, in short, no evidence and no indication of a hierarchy or of hierarchical aspirations, as far as the apostles are concerned.

The special ministry of the apostles was the bringing of the Gospel to all nations. And from all accounts it appears that most of them soon left Jerusalem for that purpose. But it was necessary to have men in the increasing number of congregations who would build upon the foundations laid by the apostles. For this purpose the Lord provided servants of the Word. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; . . . for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. 4, 11. 12; Rom. 12, 6. 8; 1 Cor. 12, 28. The apostles, especially Paul, had assistants, who worked with them in the ministry. Notable examples were Barnabas, Acts 4, 36; 9, 27; 11, 22—30; 13, 2ff.; 1 Cor. 9, 6, and Silas, or Silvanus, Acts 15, 32; 15, 40; 1 Thess. 1, 1; 2 Thess. 1, 1. We must mention also the younger men, who are properly termed disciples of Paul: Timothy, Acts 16, 1. 21; 1 Cor. 4, 17; 16, 1; Phil. 1, 1; 2, 19; Col. 1, 1; 2 Thess. 1, 1; 3, 2. 6; Heb. 13, 23; and Titus, 2 Cor. 2, 13; 7, 14; 8, 16. 23; 12, 18; Gal. 2, 1. 3. Some of the men who were active in the service were called ministers, such as Mark, Acts 13, 5. 13; 15, 37. 38; Col. 4, 10; 1 Tim. 4, 11; Tychicus, Eph. 6, 21; Col. 4, 7; 1 Tim. 4, 12; Epaphras, Col. 1, 7; 4, 12; Epaphroditus, Phil. 2, 25; and Archippus, Col. 4, 17. We read also of evangelists, such as Philip, Acts 8, 5; 21, 8, and Apollos, Acts 18, 24. 25; 1 Cor. 1, 12; 16, 12. Prophets, too, are enumerated in the list of the servants of the Church. 1 Cor. 14, 3, 29—32; Acts 21, 10. 11. All these men seem

to have been used principally for missionary work, for the first founding and establishing of the congregations. If they were in charge of congregations, it was only temporarily. And whenever their work is spoken of, it is referred to as a service of the believers, never as governing and exacting obedience, except in so far as they demanded submission to the Word of God.

The permanent ministry of the Word was soon entrusted to a special class of church officers, the *bishops, elders, presbyters,* or *angels,* of the congregations (*ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, ἄγγελοι*), who were not successors of the apostles, but labored by their side, having charge of local parishes. Relief was sent to the elders of the church at Jerusalem by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Acts 11, 30. Barnabas and Paul ordained elders in the churches of Asia Minor. Acts 14, 23. The elders of Jerusalem are mentioned together with the apostles. Acts 15, 6. Paul addressed the elders of the church at Ephesus, calling them bishops, or overseers. Acts 20, 17. 28. When Paul made his last journey to Jerusalem, all the elders were present with James. Acts 21, 18. In the introduction to the letter to the Philippians, Paul addresses all the saints at Philippi together with the bishops and deacons. Phil. 1, 1. In the Pastoral Letters, Paul discusses the qualifications of bishops and elders. 1 Tim. 3, 1—7; 4, 14; 5, 17—22; Titus 1, 5. 7—9. And Peter exhorts the elders as one of their own number to do the work of their office with all faithfulness. 1 Pet. 5, 1—4. Finally, in Revelation, John addresses the angels of the seven churches of Asia Minor, admonishing them to do the work of their calling with all zeal. Rev. 1, 20; 2, 1. 8. 12. 18; 3, 1. 7. 14; cf. 1, 11. "While the apostles were still active in their peculiar ministry, the churches throughout Christendom had their elders, and the apostles themselves saw to it that the congregations everywhere should be provided with faithful stewards of the mysteries of God." (*Theol. Quart.,* VII, 18.)

Another office which was created very early in the Church, due to a specific need, was that of *deacons* and *deaconesses.* During the first weeks or months after Pentecost the apostles had charge not only of the ministry of the Word, but also of the daily ministrations to the widows. But the congregation grew so rapidly that they were not able to discharge the double duty. It was then that the congregation chose seven men for this service at tables, who were installed by the apostles with *the laying on* of hands. Acts 6, 1—6. This institution was copied by other churches and became such a general custom that Paul devotes a section to the discussion of

their work. Both men and women were employed. 1 Tim. 3, 8—13; Rom. 16, 1. "These deacons were subsidiary, or assistant, officers in the churches. Their office was not properly a second ministry, with different duties or functions, as the functions of a secretary differ from that of a treasurer. . . . Certain functions of the ministry were delegated to a sufficient number of men, who were qualified for the performance of these particular duties." (*Theol. Quart.,* VII, 22; cf. pp. 17—29. *Synodalbericht* of Nebraska Dist., 1903, 29—47.)

There was, then, in the Church at the time of the apostles no hierarchy nor any attempt to rule the congregations through a hierarchical system. This feature is all the more striking since the apostles, as inspired ministers of God, might easily have arrogated to themselves a power over the Church which would have given them a position of supremacy, with almost unlimited external influence. Instead of that, they are willing to be considered, and labor as, servants of the congregations. The apostles are named with the brethren. Acts 11, 1. The whole church was gathered together to hear the report of Barnabas and Paul. Acts 14, 27. The same men were received of the church and of the apostles and elders of Jerusalem, and the question which they brought for consideration was laid before the apostles and elders with the whole church. Acts 15, 4. 22. 23. And upon the last arrival of Paul in Jerusalem the multitude was called together. Acts 21, 17—22. All the members of the congregation had equal rights of discussion and vote in the matters pertaining to the work of God's kingdom, and only such restrictions were observed as God Himself had made. 1 Cor. 14, 34.

This ideal condition of affairs lasted throughout the first century, or as long as the apostles and their disciples were living. But the end of the century brought the first indications of an approaching change, which became more noticeable in the sub- or post-apostolic age. Thus, in the *First Epistle of Clement* it is stated that "the apostles appointed their first converts to be bishops and deacons of the future believers" (chap. XLII; Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers,* 81), although he adds, a few chapters later, that such appointments were made with the consent of the whole church (p. 85). The words of Ignatius, in his *Epistle to the Ephesians,* might well cause more concern, since he exhorts the members to "live in harmony with the will of the bishop" (chap. IV, p. 177) and urges them to be "careful not to oppose the bishop, that we may be subject to God" (chap. V, p. 179). He has a similar exhor-

tation in his *Letter to the Magnesians* (chap. IV, p. 201). That Ignatius goes beyond the doctrine of the New Testament becomes clear a few chapters later, where he writes: "Be zealous to do all things in harmony with God, with the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles, and the deacons, who are most dear to me, entrusted with the service of Jesus Christ." (Chap. VI, p. 203.) The same point is emphasized in the *Epistle to the Trallians:* "Likewise let all respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as the bishop is also the type of the Father, and the presbyters as the Council of God and the College of Apostles." (Chap. III; cf. chap. II, p. 215; chap. VII, p. 219.) In a similar manner, Ignatius treats of the same matter in the *Epistle to the Smyrneans,* chaps. VIII and IX, and in the *Epistle to Polycarp,* chap. VI. The *Didache,* on the other hand, seems to adhere closely to the apostolic idea, for it mentions the prophets and teachers as the chief laborers in missionary work (chap. XIII) and the bishops and deacons as the men in charge of the work in the individual congregations (chap. XV).

So far, then, as the early postapostolic age is concerned, at least till about 150 A. D., the democratic form of church government remained in general use in the Church, though a tendency was becoming manifest to emphasize, on the one hand, the power of the bishop and, on the other hand, the obedience due to his word. The indiscriminate use of bishop and presbyter is also disappearing, the former word being used almost entirely to designate the chief officer of the church, or local congregation.

2. The Rise and Full Development of the Hierarchical System.

The germ of the hierarchical system, as we have seen, was contained in the form of the church offices which had been instituted in the time of the apostles. The idea of higher and lower clergy and of a difference between clergy and laity in the government of the congregation was brought out toward the end of the first and the beginning of the second century. It remained for the succeeding centuries, till the beginning of the Middle Ages, to take hold of this pleasant idea, to foster and to develop it, until it finally resulted in the complete hierarchical structure, which dominated the world for centuries and has kept a large part of its influence to the present day.

It is doubtful whether the προεστώς of Justin Martyr was intended to set the bishop apart as an official with executive powers. The description of the Christian services as given by Justin seems

to point more to a bishop or presbyter in the performance of the ministry of the Word, the deacons being portrayed as assistants, much in the same way as in the time of the apostles. But it is evident, also, as Hatch points out, that the division of labor between presbyters and deacons became definitely fixed. In other words, the ranks of the clergy were defined with greater exactness.

To what extent this was soon carried, appears especially from the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Canons of the Apostles.* A few passages will suffice to show the scope of the development from the third to the sixth century. "The deacon is to you Aaron, and the bishop, Moses. Let him not do anything at all without his bishop, nor give anything without his consent." (Book II, chap. XXX.) All disputes, according to the same authority, were to be settled by the bishops. According to Book VIII it was necessary that both presbyters and deacons (deaconesses) be ordained by the bishop. "A bishop blesses, but does not receive the blessing. He lays on hands, ordains, offers, receives the blessing from bishops, but by no means from presbyters. A bishop deprives any clergyman who deserves deprivation, excepting a bishop. A presbyter blesses, but does not receive the blessing, yet does he receive the blessing from a bishop or a fellow-presbyter. A deacon does not bless, baptize, or offer." (Book VIII, chap. XXVIII.)

This development is plainly illustrated also in the *Clementines* (end of 2d century). According to these homilies and letters the doctrine of church polity was definitely fixed as follows: The bishop occupies the place of Christ (*Χριστοῦ τόπον πεπίστευται*). Therefore any one offending the bishop sins against Christ; the honor given to him is given to Christ; he has power to bind and to loose. Upon the connection with him salvation itself depends; through him the individual believer is brought to Christ and by Christ to God. Whoever, therefore, yields obedience to the bishop will obtain salvation; he that refuses submission will be punished by God. On the other hand, it is the duty of the bishop not to exercise his power in a tyrannical manner, like the pagan princes, but to defend the insulted like a father, to visit the sick like a physician, to watch for his congregation like a shepherd, to have the welfare and salvation of all at heart. Secular business should not engage his attention; for business matters are properly taken care of by the laymen; all his care must be directed to heavenly things. His chief duty is to guard the purity of the doctrine.

The second rank was occupied by the presbyters. As commanding is the special function of the bishops, so the execution of

these commands is the principal duty of the presbyters. They also were required to urge young men to consummate early marriages; but also older people should be admonished to enter holy wedlock. Another duty of the presbyters is to act as *peacemakers* in all quarrels among the Christians.

The third rank included the deacons (and deaconesses). The moral condition of the congregation was their special care; they were to bring information received regarding any delinquency to the bishop. As a matter of course, visiting the sick and similar services were required of them.

The division between clergy and laity was strongly marked and absolute. If the Church resembles a ship, whose master is Christ, whose row-master is the bishop, and whose crew are the presbyters, then the lay people are the passengers. These are brought to Christ and thus to God by the bishop; their salvation is conditioned by their obedience to the bishop. They owe him absolute submission and the greatest respect because the honor given him is shown to Christ. They are in duty bound to provide for the maintenance of the bishop, presbyters, deacons, etc., since the bishop should be free from all secular duties. The matter of collecting dues was a duty of the deacons. (Schliemann, *Die Clementinen,* 248—250.)

From this and other evidence, especially from Tertullian, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome, Irenaeus, and others, it seems that the following situation obtained at the end of the fourth century: "A single officer came in time to monopolize the name which had been shared by members of the governing body in common." (Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches,* 39.) He first held the position of president, or presiding elder, in the council of ministers or in church services. Later he was commonly, and at last he was exclusively, termed the bishop. He was the supreme almoner, the deacons working under his direction. His ministry was variously known as *οἰκονομία, διακονία, λειτουργία.*

The deacons were the assistants of the bishop in the service as well as in the parish or diocese. They were originally chosen to serve in the division of alms, *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις.* (*Apostolic Constitutions,* III, 19.) And they shared with the bishop and his council the duties of discipline in the capacity of officers of inquiry. They were subordinate in rank, a fact which at first was not so pronounced, but later was emphasized. The status of the bishop was raised until he was placed on the level of the Old Testament priests and, later, the high priest, while the deacons were regarded

as corresponding to the Levites. They were in closer relation to the bishops than the presbyters. Their entire number in one congregation formed a college, headed by the archdeacon, who was the bishop's assistant in the ecclesiastical administration.

The presbyters formed a council, or committee, of administration, *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκεπτόμενοι* (Polycarp, *Ad Philippenses*, 6. Hatch, p. 67). The presbyters were, in theory, the council of the bishop, even after the bishop had asserted a virtual autocracy. The conception of the office as essentially disciplinary and collegiate, which obtained in the second century, was later again superseded by the idea that the ministration of the Word and the Sacrament is the function of the presbyter. In earlier days, Baptism and the Eucharist administered by the presbyter had been valid, though, as a matter of fact, he baptized only in emergencies, and the bishop usually celebrated the Eucharist. Later the functions of the presbyter became more and more independent, and he was permitted to perform all the work of a pastor in charge of a congregation, the distinction being retained only in the case of confirmation.

But one fact was established during these centuries beyond the shadow of a doubt, namely, the supremacy of the bishop in his parish or diocese. The fact that a centralized administration materially aided in the governing of the congregation undoubtedly hastened this development, and the necessity of unity of doctrine demanded that some single person be made the protector of the faith. The bishops also claimed the right of readmitting the *lapsi* into membership as an inherent function of the episcopate. It soon became the rule to have only one bishop in a community. The bishop, as the custodian and conservator of apostolic teaching, took the apostles' place, succeeding not only to the "seat of the apostles," but also to their powers.

For a long time, in fact, till the Council of Nicaea, the distinction between clergy and laity was not marked, except in services. The whole body of Christians was upon the same level. At first the layman could not speak as a teacher if the bishop was present; then not, if any officer was present; finally not at all. At first he brought his own gifts to the altar, then he could only stand outside of the dais, and finally he could not even go beyond the iconastasies, or rood-screen, to witness the "mysteries."

A factor which greatly aided in widening the gulf between clergy and laity was the power of monasticism. The celibacy of the clergy was advocated as being conducive to greater holiness; the tonsure was adopted as a further mark of distinction. Not

only all questions of doctrine, but also those regarding discipline were decided by the clergy without the laity. The congregation as such was ignored more and more in all the affairs of administration.

In the mean time the great Ecumenical, or General, Councils were being held — Nicaea, 325; Constantinople, 381; Ephesus, 431; Chalcedon, 451; Constantinople, 553 and 680; Nicaea, 787; Constantinople, 869. With each succeeding council and synod the laity was more decidedly set aside, finally being ignored altogether. They served to extend the assertion of Cyprian: "Within the limits of his own community a bishop has no superior but God." The decrees of a single bishop had meaning and power for his own diocese only. The decrees of a council were binding upon all the dioceses represented by bishops, either of the district or of the entire Church.

But the councils and synods had a further effect also upon the clergy and their rank. A gradation was recognized between the bishop of the chief city of a province, known as the metropolitan, and that of the chief city of a diocese, called exarch, or patriarch. Thus, in the East, Caesarea, Constantinople, and other cities became the seats of powerful bishops, also Alexandria in Egypt. And in the West, Milan, and especially Rome, soon assumed the leading rôle, the latter finally gaining the supremacy. As early as the second century the *Clementines* had spoken of a "bishop of bishops," applying the name, at this time, to James of Jerusalem. The bishops of Rome became more and more insistent that they had the right to bear this title, as successors of St. Peter. At the time of Leo I opposition to this assumption had practically ceased, and in the days of Gregory the Great the supremacy of the Roman See was universally conceded.

This development brought about a stricter organization of the parishes in a diocese and of the several dioceses in a metropolitan see. In Rome the city was divided into sections, each of which was entrusted to a deacon. There was only one consecration of the Eucharistic elements, to wit, by the bishop, these being sent to the several presbyters and congregations. When the bishop of Rome came to have a preponderating influence in Western Christendom, his council, or college, of clergy became so important that the greatest dignitaries were willing, at least nominally, to become members of it in order to name the successor of a bishop after his death. Thus the College of Cardinals came into existence.

In metropolitan dioceses the suburban districts were either

under the jurisdiction of the city bishop or had a χωρεπίσκοπος. In communities with many small scattered villages two presbyters and two deacons were assigned to each church, the bishop traveling from one community to another. Later there was a bishop wherever there was a Roman municipality, and an archbishop wherever there was a provincial metropolis. The clergy of a diocese were supposed to convene with the bishop once a year. At first the bishop and the presbyters met; later the canons, including all the lower clergy on the church-roll, who lived under monastic rules with the intention of entering orders, were added, and so the *capitulum,* or chapter, often showed an imposing array of names.

During the Middle Ages the several ranks of the clergy were further fixed until finally the sequence stood as follows: Pope, archbishop, bishop, priest, deacon, subdeacon (to assist the deacon), acolyte (the personal servant of the bishop), exorcist (in charge of the energumens), lector (reader), ostiarius (in charge of the buildings). In addition to these members of the clergy many churches had special choirs in their employ, and the members of these choirs were included with, and wore the dress of, the lower clergy. The laity as such was entirely disregarded. Thus the hierarchical system reached its highest development. (Cf. Hatch, chaps. III—VII; Loehe, *Haus-, Schul- und Kirchenbuch,* 2: 10—13.)

3. Church Government in the Reformed Denominations.

The three types of church government, the episcopal, the presbyterian, and the congregational, are all represented in the Protestant churches of America, to which, for the sake of briefness, we confine ourselves in this chapter. There is also a certain amount of eclecticism. The general tendency seems to be toward a strong central administration in order to unify forces and do more effective work. But there is also a reactionary element apparent, as Sheldon says, which seeks greater power for the individual local organization.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of America received its form of government from the Anglican Church. The regulations governing the Church are contained in the *Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.* The archbishop is at the head of a metropolitan see. The bishop is at the head of the urban, or municipal, see. His church is the cathedral. His duties are — to reside inside his jurisdiction, to visit each church in his see every three years, to

keep a record of all his official acts, and to issue a pastoral letter from time to time, the favorite season being that of Lent. In his absence the ecclesiastical authority devolves upon the bishop coadjutor. The head of the individual parish is the rector, with whom are associated ministers, or priests, among whom he occupies the position of *primus inter pares*. The control of worship and the spiritual jurisdiction of the parish are vested in the rector, whose duties also are to read the pastoral letters to the congregation, to keep a registry of baptisms, etc. The deacons are subject to the bishop of the diocese and are not to accept work outside the diocese. The deacons are often candidates for higher orders, but are not to be transferred until they have passed the examinations for the priesthood. Their studies as candidates embrace a period of three years. If there is no rector in a parish, the deacon acts under the direction of the priest. Next in order come the deaconesses, who may be either unmarried or widowed. They are appointed by the bishop after a preparation of two years. The postulants and candidates are such men as have made application for orders and are going through a course of preparation. Lay readers are employed upon occasion, especially in missionary parishes. Other laymen are permitted to make addresses upon special occasions. Thus the episcopal form of government is carried out very consistently. The Protestant Episcopal Church, like the Church of England, believes in the Apostolic Succession, deeming the ordination in an unbroken chain since the time of Peter and the apostles necessary for the validity of the priesthood.

The Presbyterian Church in America, like that of Scotland, has avoided the episcopal, or prelative, form of government, on the one hand, and the independent form, on the other. In the *Confession of Faith* (chap. XXX, I and II) this Church states that "the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrates. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power, respectively, to retain and remit sins," etc. According to the "Form of Government," as contained in the *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America,* "the pastoral office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness. As the person who fills this office has the oversight over the flock of Christ, he is termed bishop. As he feeds them with spiritual food, he is termed pastor. As he serves Christ in his Church, he is termed minister. As it is his duty to be grave and prudent, . . . he is termed pres-

byter and elder. As he is the messenger of God, he is termed the angel of the Church. As he is sent to declare the will of God to sinners, he is termed ambassador. And he is also a steward over the mysteries of Christ." The ruling elders are the representatives of the people, ruling well, but not laboring in the Word and doctrine. They, together with the pastor or pastors of a particular congregation, form the church session (or presbytery), of which the pastor is the moderator. The deacons are distinct officers of the congregation, whose duty it is to take care of the poor and to manage the temporal affairs of the church. The presbytery proper consists of all the ministers of a district, not less than five being necessary to form such a body, together with one ruling elder from each congregation. The synod is a convention of bishops and elders within a larger district, embracing at least three presbyteries. The highest judicatory of the Church is the General Assembly, a representation of the whole Church, which governs and determines in regard to every part and to all parts united. But the real government is that of the local session, which maintains spiritual government, receives members, suspends and excludes from the Sacraments, and appoints delegates to the higher judicatories. The congregation as such does not take part in the government of the Church.

According to the *Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (edited by Bishop Andrews, 1904) the form of church government in that church-body is patterned after that of the Anglican Church, with certain eclectic features. The bishop is elected by the General Conference and ordained by the laying on of hands of three bishops or at least one bishop and three elders. His duty is to preside at the annual conference, to form districts, fix appointments of preachers, and not allow a presiding elder to preside in the same district more than six consecutive years. A missionary bishop has charge of a specified Foreign Mission field. The presiding elders are chosen and appointed by the bishops. Their duty is to travel through the districts, visit the charges, change the appointments, etc. A minister, or elder, has authority to preach, to conduct worship, to solemnize marriages, and to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper. A deacon is elected by the annual conference, followed by the laying on of hands by the bishop. He has authority to preach, to conduct divine worship, to solemnize marriages, to administer Baptism, and to assist the elder in administering the Lord's Supper. The pastor, or preacher, in charge has the oversight of all other preachers in

his parish. He appoints all leaders, accepts members, etc. Local lay preachers and exhorters for leading prayer and exhortation are licensed by the quarterly conference, under the chairmanship of the presiding elder. A deaconess must be unmarried and over twenty-three years of age. She must render two years of probationary service before being enrolled. The congregation as such has no part in its spiritual government nor in the choice of its own pastor, or minister.

The form of government in the Baptist Church belongs to the independent group, each congregation being a self-governing unit, actually and absolutely independent in the exercise of all its churchly rights, privileges, and prerogatives. This independence is limited only as each church is an administrative and interpretative body only, under the Word of God, each church, as a spiritual body, being its own highest tribunal. The pastorate and the ministry, according to Baptist policy, are related, but not identical. Evangelists and missionaries are without pastoral responsibility, but the ministerial service is identified with the pastorate. The local pastor is also called teacher or preacher. The deacons, faithful, prudent, experienced, devout men, are chosen by a free vote of the congregation, they have charge of the sick and needy, and, in general, of the temporal affairs of the congregation. (Hiscox, *The New Directory of Baptist Churches,* 1906.)

The form of government in the Congregational Church is also the independent form or that of pure democracy. Any company of people professing Christianity are thereby a true Church of Christ. The officers of each congregation are: 1) bishops, also called elders, evangelists, angels, pastors, and teachers; 2) deacons. The ministerial associations and the district conferences of the Congregational Church are altogether free. (Dexter, *A Handbook of Congregationalism,* 1880.)

4. Church Government in the Lutheran Church.

One of the first features which Luther attacked in the Roman Church after he had come to the knowledge of the truth was the hierarchical system with its many evils, including not only the papacy itself, but also nepotism, simony, and a general perversion of right. Luther's demand, in the face of the conditions then existing, was to make all the officers of the Church responsible to the Church as a whole and the individual pastors to their congregations, under the Word of God. He was, at first, by no means insistent upon a complete reformation of church government. He

even went so far as to state that he would not object to the Pope as supreme head of the Church *ex jure humano,* but he was opposed to the office as long as it was forced upon the Church *ex jure divino.* But when all his efforts to convince the hierarchy had failed and the Pope's Church had openly been branded as unbiblical and heretic, Luther worked most diligently for the introduction of a form of church government which would carry out the democratic ideas of the New Testament in a most consistent manner. How far his ideas had crystallized in 1523 may be seen from his *Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens der Gemeinde zu Leissnig.* (10, 960—977.) The calling, choosing, installing, and dismissing of the incumbents of the pastoral office, according to this document, should be and remain in the hands of the congregation, according to the guidance of Holy Scriptures. All the rights of the Christian congregation should be vested and remain in the entire congregation as such, which, for that purpose, namely, of exercising these rights and watching over their proper discharge, should have stated meetings, three times a year. A council of ten deacons were to have charge of the property of the congregation, paying the salary of minister, teacher, etc., take care of the poor and needy, and discharge all other work which was commonly done by deacons in apostolic times.

These ideas of Luther, with which he returned to the democratic church government of the early centuries, were in conformity with the statement of Christ. Matt. 23, 10. Article XIV of the Augustana stated clearly and succinctly: "In regard to church government we teach that no one shall publicly teach or preach or administer the Sacrament in the Church without a legitimate call." The usurpations of the hierarchy were condemned in Article XXVIII, "Of the Power of the Bishops." The Apology took up the question concerning the doctrine of the Church at length, making plain the distinction between the visible and the invisible church. In an improper and derived sense there is a visible Church, consisting of all those who profess Christianity and uphold its institutions. In this external, or visible, Church every local congregation has the right to call and install ministers of the Word. The ministry is the highest office in the Church (Art. XV), but it depends for its power upon the valid call of the congregation (Art. XXVIII, "De Potestate Ecclesiastica"). The same trend of thought is found in the Articuli Smalcaldici, Pars II, Art. IV, "De Papatu"; Pars III, Art. X, "De Initiatione, Ordine et Vocatione": "As the ancient examples of the Church and of

the Fathers teach us, we will and should ourselves ordain fitting persons for such office," in the *Formula Concordiae,* Pars II, Solida Declaratio, Art. X, "De Ceremoniis Ecclesiasticis," and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, however, the practise of the Lutheran Church in Germany fell short of the theory, as the publications of Richter and Sehling show. From the first the princes, electors, and dukes of the various German countries that had accepted the Reformation were actively concerned in the propagation of the true Church. The idea of ecclesiastical courts having been broached and discussed at Smalcald in 1537, it was put into execution at Wittenberg in 1539. At first it was only a matrimonial and disciplinary court, but the jurisdiction of similar consistories was soon extended to include all cases of church discipline. In some instances these courts practically exercised episcopal jurisdiction; in other cases they were ecclesiastical courts, exercising the functions which were properly vested in the local congregation. At present the ecclesiastical consistories in the Lutheran sections of Germany are little more than councils for the adjudication of administrative business.

In other countries, such as Denmark, Norway, Sweden, where the state church is Lutheran, more of an episcopal form of church government obtains, the king, in the case of the last-named country, even being considered the *summus episcopus,* and the bishop of the oldest diocese being called the Archbishop of Upsala.

In America the democratic form of church government has had the best opportunity for a thorough application. Yet there is a considerable variation in the various Lutheran bodies. In some cases the presbyterian form is in use, in others the synodical, while some few have a thoroughly democratic government, the doctrine of the Church and of the office of the Word held by the general organizations coloring and influencing their polity.

The formula for the "Government and Discipline of the General Synod" (United Lutheran Church) names three judicatories governing the Church: "the *Council* of each individual church, the *District Synods,* consisting of the clergy and lay delegates from a particular district of country, and one *General Synod,*" p. 834. "Pastors are amenable for their conduct to the synod to which they belong; and that synod is the tribunal which has the entire jurisdiction over them," p. 836. "The other officers of the church are elders and deacons, who are elected by the members of the church as their agents to perform some of the duties originally devolving on themselves," p. 837. "The Church Council is the lowest judicatory of the Church, consisting of the pastor, or

pastors, and all the elders and deacons of a particular church," p. 838.

In the Missouri Synod and those synods affiliated with it in the Synodical Conference the democratic form of government is carried out very consistently. All male members above the age of twenty-one years (in some cases, above eighteen) are admitted to voting membership. All the business of the congregation is transacted by the assembly of the voting members, such as the conferring of the pastoral office upon ministers, candidates, and teachers, etc. The congregation as a body has the supreme power in the external and internal administration and management of its own ecclesiastical and congregational affairs, limited in this power only by the Word of God and the Symbols of the Lutheran Church. The church wardens, elders, deacons, etc., at any time in office have no authority beyond that which has been conferred upon them by the congregation, and whatever power may have been delegated to them is at all times liable to change or rescission by the congregation. (*Theol. Quart,* I, 326—330.) The Synod also makes no laws, nor does it act as an ecclesiastical court. "In its relation to its members Synod is not a governing body, exercising legislative or coercive powers. In all matters involving the Christian congregation's right of self-government, Synod is but an advisory body. Accordingly, no congregation shall be bound by any resolution of Synod that imposes something which is either contrary to the Word of God or that to such congregation appears unsuited to its condition." (*Lutheran Witness,* XXXVI, 1917, p. 312.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. — The higher critics are accustomed to say that the authorship of the fourth gospel forms one of the vexing problems in the New Testament field. The reason why they find a problem here is their unwillingness to accept the well-attested apostolic origin of this glorious book. What is the basis of their refusal? Nothing but their *a priori* conclusion that the supernatural cannot be true, that miracles cannot happen. Dr. J. A. Faulkner, writing in the *Biblical Review,* gives an admirable *résumé* of the attitude of unbelieving scholars on the authorship of this book. We set down here in brief form some of his most interesting statements and conclusions.

This gospel was written about 90 A. D. Coming thirty years later than the synoptic gospels, it nevertheless was universally accepted by the Church, which must have had sufficient evidence that

the book was by the Apostle John. Marcion, the Gnostic, rejected it, as he did Matthew and Mark, because it was not anti-Jewish enough to suit his theology. He does not seem to have opposed it as being unapostolic. Other Gnostics accepted it as the work of an apostle. Celsus, the pagan critic, writing about 177, does not doubt the apostolicity of this book. The Gnostics, called Alogi, indeed, ascribed it to Cerinthus, not on historical grounds, however, but because of their opposition to the Logos doctrine of John. The Church of the Middle Ages and of the Reformation era regarded the book as written by the Apostle John. Not until 1792, when an ex-minister of the Church of England, Evanson, wrote on what he termed the Dissonance of the Four Evangelists, was this position attacked in modern times. Bretschneider was the first modern scholar of note to publish doubts on the Johannean authorship of the fourth gospel. His book, written in Latin, appeared 1820. "He calls attention to the lack of miracles, the kind of miracles that are given, the absence of parables, and the presence of discourses and of a hidden gnosis, or knowledge. He thinks the epistles are not from John and that the gospel was composed in Egypt about the middle of the second century." In Bretschneider's book are found practically all the arguments which before or since have been advanced against the apostolicity of the fourth gospel with any show of plausibility. It is remarkable to find that several years later this critic frankly confessed that the replies which his book had called forth had convinced him of the genuineness of John's gospel and that he now considered the matter settled for the theological public.

Schleiermacher, who certainly was not afflicted with too great a love for conservative views, earnestly contended for the apostolicity of this book.

D. F. Strauss placed the origin of all the gospels about the middle of the second century; hence he did not consider the fourth gospel as apostolic. His reasons were philosophical, not historical.

F. C. Baur held similar views. But of the famous (or infamous) Tuebingen School which he built up, one scholar after the other abandoned the position taken by Baur. Ritschl, originally one of his disciples, states in 1857: "I would explain that I consider the gospel [John's] to be authentic, not only because the denial of its authenticity raises far greater difficulties than its acceptance, but also because the presentation of the revelation of Jesus in the three other gospels requires for its completion the discourses in John."

De Wette, at first very radical in his attitude, wrote in the fifth edition of his *Einleitung*: "I have placed myself decidedly more than heretofore among the defenders of the gospel of John, though I am still far from being so decided as my friend Bleek."

Luecke, who wrote a great commentary on this gospel and who is described as not only an "accomplished philologist and New Testament scholar, but an artist, poet, and mystic, and, besides, a man of docile spirit, ever seeking new light and ready to examine new theories," wrote: "I have carefully examined the recent and critical treatises on John and have earnestly tested them." The conclusion

which he arrived at is thus given by Faulkner: "After lifelong study of the Johannean question he still is firmly convinced that the apostle was the author of the gospel, that it was written in Ephesus not earlier than 80 and perhaps as late as the 90's." Faulkner then adds: "That means that you can, if you wish, reject the gospel on rationalistic presuppositions, but you cannot reject it on any convincing critical, historical, or religious grounds." Well said! ARNDT.

The Pulpit and Its Message. — "Roger Babson does not profess to be a theologian," writes the *Biblical Review* (July, 1926), "but he knows a good bit about the feelings of folks in and out of the Church, and many preachers might ponder this observation of his respecting the church service: —

" 'People no longer go to church for education, economic instruction, political discussion, or amusement. There was a time when the church could best teach these, but now the people can learn them better from other sources. One trouble with the churches to-day is that they are endeavoring to dispense things which people can get from better-equipped sources outside the church. But the churches continue to be the only source where a man can get courage, faith and inspiration, and these are the things which business men are craving to-day. When a business man goes to church and hears the preacher discuss politics or economics, or listens to an appeal for money, he feels that he has been defrauded. These are necessary, but they should not come into a Sabbath service. They should be limited to evening services, or week-day services. What business men want is to receive courage to resist temptation, faith to cease from worry, and inspiration to do hard things. When the churches give us these, they will not only be filled to the doors, but they will mobilize for good the vast amount of human energy which is now being dissipated or spent along destructive lines.' " We miss in Mr. Babson's criticism the constructive element which tells the preacher how and what to preach so that the business men may "resist temptation, cease from worry, and do hard things." The old, pure Gospel is still the only message that belongs in the pulpit and the church and that, too, people, in general, expect to find there. MUELLER.

Doors of Andover Seminary Closed for the Coming School-Year. A unique situation has arisen with respect to Andover Seminary, the well-known and heavily endowed school of Congregationalism. The *Presbyterian* reports: —

"In Andover Seminary, the Congregational theological school in Massachusetts, the faculty has resigned *en masse,* and the trustees have announced that all courses will be suspended for the academic year 1926—27.

"Andover Seminary planned a closer affiliation with Harvard. The plan has been set aside by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, and in the decision, which holds the plan to be incompatible with the charter of the seminary, it is declared that a creedal statement, drafted at the time of its founding in 1807, is legally binding in its original historical meaning and literal terminology, and that all

teachings and practises contrary to its requirements must be abandoned.

"The founders of Andover were determined that the Christian faith should be perpetuated without change through the agency of the institution they established. They required the trustees of the seminary and the members of the faculty to declare their adherence to a definite statement of belief. The members of the faculty were ordered to renew this adherence every five years."

Andover Seminary was founded to guard orthodoxy when Harvard University had come into the control of the Unitarians. Gradually the faculty of Andover drifted into the channel of Liberalism, and of late the doctrines taught were in several instances the direct opposite of what the founders of the school wished to have taught there. It will be interesting to see whether the work of the school will ever be resumed or not. ARNDT.

Why Liberals Objected to Dr. Machen. — In explanation of the objections recently voiced by Liberals in the Northern Presbyterian Church to the election of Dr. Machen to the chair of Apologetics and Christian Ethics at Princeton Theological Seminary, the *Presbyterian Standard,* of Charlotte, N. C., remarks: "Between the two extremes, the Conservatives and the Liberals, there is a third party, who are for peace, and for the sake of peace they are willing to yield some convictions, arguing that a few erroneous doctrines are less to be dreaded than a divisive strife. Dr. Machen has been especially active in the Conservative camp and has made himself obnoxious to certain parties in the Church. Though he came endorsed for the chair of Apologetics and Christian Ethics by a vote of the Board of Directors of Princeton of 19 to 9, the Assembly voted to hold back his confirmation till a committee, appointed to look into affairs at Princeton Seminary, had reported. It seems that it is charged that Dr. Machen has certain idiosyncrasies that render it difficult for his fellows to work with him. Such is the charge of those who oppose him; but we suspect that the blows he has given Modernism has made him *persona non grata* to many in the Assembly. When an Assembly refuses to confirm a scholar like Dr. Machen as a teacher in Princeton Seminary, though the Board of Directors has accepted him, and then elects Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, the president of Union Theological Seminary, New York, as a member of the Board of National Missions, it seems to an outsider a case of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel." MUELLER.

Dr. Davis Dead. — The *Presbyterian* writes: "Not only Princeton Theological Seminary, but the whole theological and educational world sustained a severe loss in the unexpected death, on June 21, of Dr. John D. Davis, at the Jefferson Hospital, Philadelphia, where he had gone for what was regarded as a minor throat operation. Since the death of D. B. B. Warfield, Dr. Davis has been the senior professor of Princeton Seminary. For some forty years Dr. Davis has been a teacher in that institution, and during that time he not only won world-wide distinction as an Old Testament scholar, but was, in

a conspicuous degree, a stimulating and thought-provoking teacher. All over the world to-day there are men who not only honor the memory of Dr. Davis because of their love and respect for him as a man, but who count him one of the chief factors in their mental and spiritual development. While Dr. Davis was the author of numerous articles on Biblical and archeological subjects, yet his outstanding contribution was *A Dictionary of the Bible,* first published in 1898 and later revised and enlarged. It is to-day, and will no doubt continue to be for some years, the best one-volume dictionary of the Bible in existence. Few scholars have left such monuments to their industry and erudition — in a form adapted to meet the needs of Bible scholars in general — as this volume affords."

An Appeal of a Baptist Layman. — Under the heading, "What the Layman Expects of His Minister," Hon. John G. Smith, in the *Watchman-Examiner* (July 15) says: "The layman expects his pastor to be a man of convictions. I tell you the average Baptist layman wants a minister who believes the Bible, and that is so whether he is a Christian or not. A man who believes nothing, is not sure of anything, has no convictions that he is ready to die for, has no business in an evangelical Protestant pulpit. How does a man expect to lead others to Christ who has only an academic knowledge of His saving grace? He may be able to entertain women at a 'pink tea' or deliver a baccalaureate sermon, but he cannot satisfy the average layman. . . . One of the encouraging things of the day is that Protestant men are returning to church. Many of them are anxious to have you tell them the Bible truths. For years I have come in contact with all sorts of men in business, in court, in churches, in lodges, and society, and there is no question in my mind about the feeling of the ordinary man. While higher education criticizes, the rank and file are returning to the faith of their fathers. Civilization has disappointed them. I can see a marked change in the attitude of the average man toward religion and the Bible since the World War. The Church passed through a period when only women and children attended. Protestant manhood now realizes that it has been a slacker." MUELLER.

An Episcopalian Revival. — The *Watchman-Examiner* (July 15) reports editorially: "In an open letter reprimanding the Church for its failure to win converts the National Commission of Evangelism of the Episcopal Church suggests plans for a nation-wide drive for 100,000 souls in 1927. The commission speaks vigorously, declaring the Episcopal Church to-day is incomparably rich in money, organization, influence, power, yet it is failing to produce anything like apostolic results. It seems that during all last year, in spite of its 135 bishops, 5,000 priests, and more than 1,000,000 members, the Episcopal Church showed a gain of only 25,000. Thus it took fifty persons and a vast amount of wealth to reach each single individual convert. In seeking to overcome this condition of indifference, the program of the commission plans for an intensive and practical campaign, nation-wide in scope, whole-hearted in motive and method,

and concentrated within a period of one week. The tone of this brief, but significant crusade will be genuinely evangelistic, the object being to stir men into enthusiasm for Jesus Christ and His Gospel and to set them on fire with zeal for the full establishment of His kingdom." The failure to be true to God's Word is perhaps the best explanation of stagnancy in the Episcopal Church. As long as high-church, low-church, and broad-church tendencies are permitted in it side by side, it will always remain a "house divided against itself." MUELLER.

No Remedy in the Secular School. — "Speaking at the Denver meeting of the American Bar Association," writes *America* (July 31), "Justice E. P. Burke, of the Supreme Court of Colorado, drew attention to certain facts in modern American life that are appalling. The number of criminals at large and at work is greater than the combined number of soldiers and policemen, and their activities cost the country more than three billion dollars annually. In every penitentiary 'repeaters' are increasing. The people at large do not censure crime severely, 'the legal profession pays adulation to its tricky members,' parole boards utterly destroy the effect of punishment ordered by the courts, and many governors, by a use of the pardoning power, which is stupid, if not actually corrupt, condone crime and encourage the criminal. 'This national disgrace is not lessening,' said Justice Burke, 'and education seems powerless to check it.'" To this denunciatory address *America* remarks: "As a remedy against social disorder and an agency for the proper training of the child the secular school has been fairly and thoroughly tested. Founded in this country some eighty-five years ago, it has been the dominant type in American education for half a century. Secularism has spread from the common schools of Horace Mann to the state institutions and to a large majority of the great colleges and universities conducted under private auspices. On the public schools of primary and secondary grade the American people annually spend a thousand million dollars, while men and women whose devotion to the welfare of the children is above the paltry tribute of praise, wear out their lives in labor for the welfare of the community. The result is sorrowfully out of proportion to the greatness of their sacrifice. After fifty years of secular school control about six out of every ten Americans have no connection with any religious creed, and 'we are the most lawless people in the world.'

"Justice Burke kept well within the limits of sober truth when he said that education seemed powerless to check the growth of crime in this country. It has never checked crime, this so-called education, but by neglecting to care for the child's religious and moral interests has raised up a generation in which cleverness supplants religion and caution takes the place of those sterling virtues which lie at the base of character. There are indications abroad that we are beginning to realize the need of religion in the school. As this realization grows keener, we shall have a system of education in this country which accords with our most precious political traditions and with the religious aspirations of millions of Americans." MUELLER.

The Date of the Exodus. — Prof. J. W. Jack has written a book on this subject, in which he, according to one of our exchanges, gives the following helpful summary of the three distinct views held by scholars concerning the time when Israel left Egypt: —

"1) The one which dates the Exodus during the XVIIIth Dynasty, about 1445 B. C., just after the long reign of Thutmose III and during that of his son, Amenhotep II. If we allow for the 'wilderness wanderings,' the entry into Canaan would correspond with the attacks of the Habiru mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna Tablets (ca. 1400—1366 B. C.) There is not much difference between this view and the one advocated by Dr. H. R. Hall and a few other scholars, except that they believe the Israelites to have left Egypt with the Hyksos (ca. 1580 B. C.) or shortly afterwards and to have lived a nomadic life of about two hundred years in the desert previous to entering Canaan as the Habiru. 2) The school which connects the Exodus with the religious revolution attempted throughout Egypt by Amenhotep IV, otherwise known as Akhenaten (ca. 1383 to 1366 B. C.). According to this view, which is strongly advocated by Mr. Arthur Weigall, the Israelites were driven out at the close of the revolution or at the commencement of the restoration under Harmhab (ca. 1358—1324 B. C). This would place the Exodus about 1350 or 1345 B. C., being about a century later than the date suggested by the first school. 3) The traditional school, which dates it more than a century later still, during the XIXth Dynasty, by regarding Rameses II (ca. 1301—1234 B. C.) as the great oppressor of the Israelites and the Exodus as having taken place during the reign of his son, Merneptah (ca. 1233—1223 B. C.), or even later still, during the reign of one of his immediate successors."

Professor Jack himself is said to be a higher critic, holding the first view of the three mentioned. The writer in the exchange from which we quote "feels that it is high time that the whole critical analysis of the Exodus and conquest narratives should be reopened."

ARNDT.

What Is Tolerance? — Under this heading Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, in an article in which he pleads for greater tolerance among Protestants, says among other things: "Surely we cannot be forever disputing about creeds and doctrines nor fiercely resistant to those whom their Creator has made differently from ourselves for the fulfilment of His own purposes. One chief duty of Protestants is to replenish the streams of love and justice which must irrigate American life if it is to be acceptable to God. . . . Sacrifice prejudices and even lower principles to the all-controlling impulse of the New Testament, which is love and service unto the uttermost. For religion has many voices and many diverse complexions, but it has one true voice in all ages and for all peoples — the voice of compassion and mercy, of patient justice and divine redemption from sin. . . . When we are rid of our provincialism and narrowness, we shall renew the spiritual battle of this evangelistic giant (John Wesley). Meanwhile, those who cannot enter it because their hearts are poisoned with contempt and distrust for their fellows should at least attempt

tolerance. . . . Discard the journals which flourish on defamation and delight in personalities. Sustain the denominational organs which cultivate amity and good will. Believe it possible, since He said it, that Christ has many other sheep which are not of this fold. Make sure that the beam is out of your own eye before you attempt to pluck the mote from your brother's eye. So much for tolerance."

It may be well for Dr. Cadman to practise himself what he preaches and be a little more tolerant towards the few remaining preachers and writers who in the name of God and of Christ are defending divine truth and warning those who would hear, against the damnable falsehoods of deceivers of the type of Dr. Cadman. They fight the battle of the Lord, not because of "provincialism and narrowness," or because their "hearts are poisoned with contempt and distrust for their fellows," or because they do not realize their own weaknesses and fail to see "the beam in their own eye," or because they would "flourish on defamation and delight in personalities," — shame upon a preacher of tolerance who himself is so intolerant as to impugn the motives of faithful Christians! — but because their Savior's Word, which alone can save sinners from damnation, is precious to them, and men like Dr. Cadman are substituting for that holy Word their own perverted notions, against which they are in duty bound to raise a warning. "Intolerance" will cease as soon as the preaching of anti-Scriptural doctrines will cease. As long as there are unfaithful ministers who will not tolerate the pure doctrines of God's Word, they need not be surprised to find faithful ministers who cannot tolerate their intolerance of the truth.

MUELLER.

The God of Modernism. — The *Lutheran Church Herald* uses some strong language in discussing this subject, but no one can say that it is undeserved or too severe. The editorial referred to says: —

"The '1926 model god' is good. Next year there will be a new model, not very different from the present one, but, like our Ford Lizzie, with some new accessories. It will be the same tin god, essentially.

"The fact is that the entire Modernist fraternity, from Fosdick and Wells and Van Loon down to their village echoes, is losing itself in the mire of pantheism. They must have some sort of god, only he must not be the God of the Bible. They must have some sort of Christ, but not the Christ of the Bible; because the Christ of the Bible is the Son of God and of the Virgin Mary, who died upon the cross for the sins of the world; who alone is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; without whom no man can come to God; whose righteousness alone, apprehended by the penitent and believing soul, avails for salvation; who rose physically from the dead and will return to judge the quick and the dead. They do not want the Christ of the Bible; nor do they want the Bible as the authoritative Word of God to men. They rig up an abstraction, stripped of the Scripture attributes and works applied to God, and try to induce the gullible of mankind to bow down before their wonderful piece of automatic mechanism.

"But the god of the Modernists, model 1926, is a Frankenstein, created from material collected from intellectual graveyards as old as the philosopher Demetrius, who flourished some 350 years before Christ, and will finally destroy its would-be scientific makers. The smoke-screen of science meddling in matters outside of its proper sphere is rapidly dissolving, and the man-monster produced by conceited philosophy will be exposed to the ridicule of rational minds."

ARNDT.

The Cause of the Trouble in Mexico. — The struggle between the Roman Catholic Church and the State in Mexico is on. The Roman hierarchy has placed the country under a partial interdict, baptism and burial being the only religious ceremonies permitted. The men performing these rites belong to the laity. The Roman Catholic Church wishes to pose as a communion of martyrs. Whether the State is not going too far in its measures is a question we shall not now discuss. That the country has a world of grievances against the Roman Catholic Church must be clear to every reader of history. In *Current History* (July number) a native Mexican, Jose Miguel Bejarano, formerly an officer of the Mexican Education Department, presents this scathing indictment of the Roman Church in Mexico:—

"The [heathen] Mexicans had their own religion, their highly developed arts, their gods, and their temples, and although some time had to elapse before a Pope decided that the conquered people were human beings and had a soul, the first step taken by the Spanish soldiers and the Spanish priests, upon gaining possession of the land, was to demolish the magnificent places of worship of the Mexican towns and to erect Christian churches upon the *débris*. The idols and the icons were destroyed, the religious monuments razed to their foundations, and the Mexicans baptized *en masse* in the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, the Pope in Rome, and the King in Spain.

"Slavery prevailed, and the Mexican, used as a beast of burden, was deprived of his traditions, his habits, his language, and his beliefs. He was branded with hot irons, like cattle. He was maltreated, exploited, and killed by a people who claimed they were making the country safe for civilization and were substituting for paganism a religion of universal brotherhood. The guns and the swords of the Spanish soldiers captured Mexico, but as generations succeeded one another, it was the missionary who kept the country under subjection.

"The Church was the center of the life of the communities, and the Church controlled all the activities of the people. With forced labor, temples were erected in every village; with forced contributions they were enriched with magnificent ornamentations. The Church was the extractor of most of the gold and silver that went to Rome and to Spain — $27,000,000 in gold in one year; $3,000,000,000 worth of silver and other metals in three centuries. Ten per cent. of the product of the land was for the Church; the ground had to be blessed by a priest before sowing, processions and religious services were organized to pray for rain in times of drought. Baptism

immediately after the birth of a child, confirmation shortly afterward, meant its consecration to the Church.

"The Mass in the morning, the rosary in the evening, confession, communion, extreme unction, the benediction of the grave within a church cemetery, and responsories for the departed kept the people well under the control of the Church even after they were dead. Even domestic animals had to be taken to church once a year to be blessed. The priest was pastor, physician, chief of police, schoolteacher, and judge.

"On November 4, 1571, only fifty years after Mexico City was occupied by Cortez, the infamous tribunal of the Holy Inquisition was established in Mexico. Luis Gonzalez Obregon, in *Mexico Viejo* [Old Mexico], writes: 'From that day terror began among the good inhabitants. . . . Fear swept over all. . . . No one lived at ease; secret denunciation threatened every one. Unfortunate was he who gave grounds for the least suspicion, and unhappy was he who merely neglected to wear a rosary.' In one day alone, on April 11, 1649, 107 persons were burned alive or tortured to death by the Inquisition in Mexico, most of them simply because they were accused of professing the Jewish religion.

"Under this system the masses in Mexico degenerated into a condition of the utmost fanaticism and bigotry at the same time that the Church developed into the most powerful force in the country. The civil authorities had to submit to the clergy, who possessed practically all the wealth in the land and who controlled the conscience of the people. Mexico became independent because the rebellion was started by a confabulation between priests and disloyal military officers; otherwise the power of the Church would have crushed the movement for liberation. . . .

"The Roman Church had more than 350 years to educate the Mexicans, to raise their economic standards, to create a free and happy people. But during all these years of almost absolute rule the Church did none of these things; only the dominant aristocracy learned to read and write. . . .

"Dr. Edward A. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, went to Mexico in 1922 and wrote an impartial and stern book entitled *The Social Revolution of Mexico.* He says: 'Not only were the dignitaries of the Church hand and glove with the great planters, but some of them were members of the same families. The peons were in the leading-strings of priests, who confirmed them in their ignorance and submissiveness and filled their minds with the most absurd ideas as to religion and the respect due to the master.' The Church is adament against land reformers, and in some cases the local priest, by denouncing the villagers petitioning for an *ejido* as 'robbers' and menacing them with denial of absolution, has bluffed them into withdrawing their petition.

"At the end of nearly four centuries of control by the Church 90 per cent. of the Mexicans did not know how to read or write. Yet the Church now professes sympathy for the poor Mexicans, who ask, 'Who is going to teach and educate us if the priests and the nuns do not?'"

ARNDT.

First Lutherans in Australia. — The *Australian Lutheran,* in its issue of May 26, carries a very informing article by a member of the Melbourne University, a man neither a German nor a Lutheran, on the German settlers in Australia. The narrative is a striking parallel to the story of our own Pilgrim Fathers. Having left Germany in June, 1833, these Lutheran pioneers of Australia arrived in the country of their adoption in November of the same year. They founded a colony on the banks of the Torrens, four miles from Adelaide. The following interesting description of the new settlement, taken from an Adelaide newspaper in 1839, is then submitted by the writer: —

"An air of serenity pervades the spot, which is exactly such a one as the imagination would portray as the retreat of persecuted piety. The industry and quiet perseverance of the German character have been fully developed at Klemzig. Four or five months only have elapsed since the hand of man began there to efface the features of the wilderness, yet nearly thirty houses have been erected, and good spacious houses some of them are. All are neat, clean, and comfortable. They are built mostly of unburned bricks, hardened by the sun. The more humble cottages consist of brushwood and thatch. The sloping bank of the river is covered with gardens. These consist of small, unfenced plots of ground, separated by narrow paths. Considering the season most favorable for gardening has not yet commenced, the number of vegetables the Germans have at the present moment under culture affords strong proof of their industry. . . . The inhabitants themselves are interesting. The visitor will find them one and all as busy and cheerful as English bees in the springtime. Out of doors they are weeding, watering, building, fishing, milking, washing, cutting wood, and carrying water. Within doors the housewife plies her domestic toil with equal assiduity. Not a soul is idle. Even the children who are too small to work, yet large enough to learn, will be found, in ordinary school-hours, receiving the tuition of their excellent and indefatigable pastor. The visitor will be struck by the obliging dispositions and courteous manner of the people. The male peasant raises his hat as he passes you and bows with an air equally removed from boorishness and servility. The female, although perhaps bending under a load of wood, has a smile and some other expression of respectful courtesy to offer the passing stranger. Even the few natives who assist them in some of their labors appear to have imbibed their spirit, being retiring and unobtrusive." ARNDT.

Has the "Jesus or Paul" Controversy Ceased? — For a number of years certain scholars have been trying to prove that Paul and not Jesus was the real founder of Christianity. Related to such efforts was the attempt to show that Paul either did not know, or at least did not correctly set forth, the teachings of Jesus. It seems that these theories are now standing on their last leg. The *Sunday-school Times* writes: —

"Professor Oepke of Leipzig now tells us (in the *Allg. Ev.-Luth.*

Kirchenzeitung) that there is in Germany a revolt all along the line from the eighteenth century tradition that minimizes or repudiates Paul and a return to the Paul-Luther teaching. He instances Brunner's work on Schleiermacher, the Lutheran renaissance in R. Holl's writings, and K. Barth's study of Romans, which has called forth a veritable crisis in liberal circles. 'That which was once branded as unscientific is now declared the latest result of science, even by theologians who wish to be considered "modern."

"'If all signs do not fail, the indifference toward Paul that marked the period from which we have come has passed its highest peak. The successor of Bousset in Giessen and of Weinel in Jena, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, has, as a result of the scientific study of Paul in the last decade, come to the perhaps somewhat optimistic conclusion that the passionate attacks of Lagarde and Nietzsche on the teaching of Paul and the man Paul have been apparently silenced for good. Paul has recovered his place of honor in primitive Christianity. Scholars are beginning to see that too much emphasis has been put on the individuality of Paul's teaching. One realizes that, in the fundamentals of his doctrine, he was at one with the earliest Christians. There are already those, R. Holl and Roland Schuetz, for example, who insist that it was just Paul who understood Jesus best.'" ARNDT.

Pastor Fliedner's Work in Spain. — According to a report in the *Lutheran Church Herald,* representatives of the committee of the Association for the Furtherance of the Gospel in Spain recently met in Cassel, Germany, to hear reports from Pastor Fliedner, of Madrid, Spain, and Pastor Funke, of Barmen, Germany, on the state of German work of evangelization in Spain. It was said that the Protestant work in that country is gradually recovering since the war and the depreciation of currencies. The international conference in Madrid, through the representatives of nine Spanish societies of evangelization and with the enthusiastic consent of Spanish churchmen, has resolved to found a Protestant theological seminary in that country, provided the decision is substantially supported by societies in England, the United States, Holland, Switzerland, France, and Germany. This is a renewal of a union seminary for the Protestants in Spain. MUELLER.

Lodge Statistics. — The *Christian Cynosure* (July, 1926) reports the following statistics on lodge membership in our country: "The latest statistics show that there are 3,199,729 Masons in the United States and Canada, a gain of about 45,000 over the previous year. The total number of Masons in the world is 4,310,000. The numerical standing of the American membership in Odd-Fellowship is 1,893,504, which is 684,800 less than last year. Besides the many secret orders which do not furnish insurance as a special feature there are over nine million benefit members and 514,279 juvenile members in the fraternal benefit societies in the United States. The total membership, including social members, is 10,898,513, banded together in 127,346 lodges.

"The Modern Woodmen of America, though they have gained only 4,020 new members and discontinued 39 local camps during the same period, have been especially active in certain communities. From the Dakotas and Minnesota have come numerous requests from ministers seeking enlightenment on this lodge from among the church people.

"The latest movement in the Masonic institution is the presentation of Oxford Bibles to initiates. This 'Craftsman's Bible,' embellished with the Masonic emblem, contains a concordance providing references to thousands of Bible passages supposedly relating to the Craft and is said to be 'an invaluable guide to a better understanding of the ritual.' It also contains an article outlining the history of the Bible as related to Masonry by Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, pastor of the Unitarian Church of Divine Paternity, New York City, and 'A Mason Charge' by the same author which claims to be 'an inspiring message to the owner of the Bible offering counsel to its proper use as the rule and guide for our faith and practise.' In view of this prominent use made of the Bible by the Masonic order, it will be interesting to note what Albert G. Mackey says in the *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, p. 104, col. 2, under the heading 'Bible': 'The Bible is used among Masons as a symbol of the will of God, however it may be expressed. And, therefore, whatever to any people expresses that will may be used as a substitute for the Bible in a Masonic lodge. Thus, in a lodge consisting entirely of Jews, the Old Testament alone may be placed upon the altar, and Turkish Masons make use of the Koran. Whether it be the Gospels to the Christian, the Pentateuch to the Israelite, the Koran to the Mussulman, or the Vedas to the Brahman, it everywhere masonically conveys the same idea — that of the symbolism of the Divine Will revealed to man. . . . In the American system the Bible is both a piece of furniture and a great light.'"

MUELLER.

The Heroes of Modern Fiction. — Whatever one may think of fiction, it ought, at any rate, not to exalt the animal instincts in man, but try to cultivate higher ideals. Just the opposite is being done in many of the stories of the day, according to this paragraph in the *Watchman-Examiner*: —

"Many of our novelists and magazine writers have been raising a crop of animal-like men in recent years and exhibiting them as heroes. The 'red-blooded man,' the 'he man,' the 'primitive man,' with their 'cave man' characteristics, are set before us as the ideals that are worshiped by lovely young heroines and feared by ordinary folks. Is this true to life? Has the 'real man' been cast into the discard? Has the chivalrous man given place to the lustful man? Is the gentleman no longer needed? President Lowell in a vigorous address not long ago said: 'When I have one of Harvard's robust graduates come up to me and loudly say: "I am a red-blooded man; I want to know why the football team doesn't win," I cannot help recalling what the psychologists say, that the human blood is most red when it has not been through the brain.'"

ARNDT.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — Since the 1910 census the Protestants of Switzerland have increased 122,700, while the Catholics have decreased 8,200. According to this item in the *Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council the Pope's life is not without its worries.

Gettysburg Seminary is this year observing its centennial. The chief founder and first president was Dr. S. S. Schmucker, who for thirty-eight years was at the head of the institution. Prof. A. R. Wentz, Ph. D., D. D., has written a book for the occasion, entitled *History of the Gettysburg Seminary;* price, $3.50.

Another glorious "achievement" of "science"! According to the *American Review of Reviews* it has been discovered that Cromagnon cave men (France) "lived twenty to twenty-five thousand years ago and that by vocation they were hunters, by avocation artists." Who is not here reminded of the famous "eulogy" on enlightened reason: "Sie sitzt nun da auf ihrem Steiss und weiss nun auch, was sie nicht weiss."

Sir William Willcocks, famous for his achievements as an irrigation engineer in the Nile and Euphrates valleys and formerly a firm adherent of the negative "higher criticism," has through the agency of Prof. R. D. Wilson's excellent little book, *Are the Higher Critics Scholarly?* come to see the light and, as the *Presbyterian* reports, says now: "I have returned to my old faith in the Word of God, and I literally live in it."

The Taungs skull found at Taungs, South Bechuanaland, Africa, in 1924, has been attracting the interest of searchers for the missing link. But, alas! one of their authorities, as Mr. G. M. Preiss writes, has now declared that this is the skull of a young ape, nothing more or less.

From the Normal School of Capital University at Columbus O., the well-known institution of the Ohio Synod, there were graduated this spring eight young ladies, who, in addition to receiving the state certificate for teaching in the schools of the State, were given a diploma stating that they have completed the course arranged for Christian day-school teachers. A number of these young ladies were immediately handed calls from congregations which were looking for such teachers.

Executives of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church of Manhattan invited Dr. Meinot C. Morgan, of Detroit, to be their associate pastor at $12,000 a year. I pass this on as a curious fact without comment.

Although undertakers are notorious "jiners" of secret and fraternal orders, most of them have left orders that they are not to be buried by a lodge. The average lodge funeral is long, depressing, and poorly rendered. One man (of the undertakers interviewed) volunteered the opinion that women's lodges were worse than the men's. — *Hom. Review.*

The *News Bulletin* of the National Lutheran Council states that the next Lutheran World Convention, according to the decision of the Executive Committee, will be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1929, either in the latter part of June or in the first part of September. Denmark, so the *Bulletin* informs us, has a population of 3,267,000, of whom 3,200,000 belong to the Lutheran Church.

Dr. A. T. Robertson, the famous grammarian of New Testament Greek, has contributed a valuable article to the *Biblical Review* (July) on the text of Matt. 1, 16, where the Sinaitic Syriac Palimpsest (discovered 1892) reads: "Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ," which is the reading adopted by von Soden and followed by Moffatt in his new translation of the New Testament. The textual problems are intricate. Concerning the historical and doctrinal content of the passage, however, there can be no doubt. Robertson's conclusion is that all the manuscripts in all the languages have the story of

the Virgin Birth, some in a shorter, others in a longer form. He holds that in the Sinaitic Syriac Palimpsest "begat" is used in a legal sense, not the physical sense. If such were not the case, the author would be clearly contradicting himself, because in Matt. 1, 18—25 this Palimpsest has the story of the Virgin Birth just as all the other manuscripts.

The Layman Company, 730 Rush St., Chicago, Ill., offers to send for 40 cts. 37 closely printed pamphlets, aggregating over 350 pages, on tithing. The title of one of these pamphlets is, *Winning Financial Freedom.*

ARNDT.

BOOK REVIEW.

The Idolatry of the Lodge. Sermon preached in the Ev. Luth. Church of Our Redeemer, St. Louis, Mo., and published at request by *L. Buchheimer.* 10 pages. 6 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This sermon on lodgery so pleased the members of the local Church of Our Redeemer that they requested Pastor Buchheimer to publish it and distribute it among its members. Concordia Publishing House, by publishing it as a tract widens its sphere of influence, and we hope that many brethren in the ministry will order it and distribute it in their congregations. Pastor Buchheimer attacks lodgery on only one point, its idolatry, but that point he makes so clear that any Christian open to conviction must see the sinfulness of lodge-membership. The sermon is divided into three parts: "1. Idolatry — what is it? 2. Where is it to be found among us? 3. How may we combat it?" A striking parallel is drawn between the idolatry of the Roman Catholic Church and that of the lodges, and it is pointed out that, since a Lutheran Christian cannot be a member of the Roman Catholic Church, he can much less hold membership in the lodge. As most of the graduates of our St. Louis Seminary are personally acquainted with Pastor Buchheimer, we need not multiply words in recommending this very serviceable tract. MUELLER.

Does the Teaching of Christian Science Agree with the Teaching of the Bible? By *Rev. H. A. Heineke.* 57 pages. (Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago.)

The purpose of this excellent tract on the delusions of Christian Science is to show that neither its distinctive nor its incidental teachings may be reconciled with Scriptural truth. Denying the fundamental tenets of Christianity concerning God, the Holy Scriptures, the vicarious suffering and death of Jesus, the resurrection, the Day of Judgment, miracles, the existence of angels and devils, the Sacraments, it rests upon purely paganistic ground. The reasons why its antichristian tenets attract many "Christians" are because they attract the "natural man" and because many deluded sufferers simply try it "as a last resort to get well." The author very earnestly warns Christians against "trying Christian Science to get well" and states the reasons why such a step is not only displeasing to God, but also hurtful to the soul's salvation. To those looking for a new refutation of the pernicious cult of Christian Science we cordially recommend this tract. MUELLER.

The History of Religions. By *E. Washburn Hopkins, Ph. D., LL. D.*, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Yale University. 596 pages; with Index, 624. $1.50. (Macmillan Publishing Co., New York.)

In this book Dr. Hopkins covers a vast field. After discussing definitions of religions and the classifications of the faiths of mankind, he passes to the presentation of primitive religions as found in Africa, Polynesia, Japan, Central Asia, and North America, to the religions of Mexico, Central and South America, of the Celts, the Teutons, and of the Slavic peoples, closing his review with a discussion of Israelitism, Islam and Christianity. The book is packed with facts, an epitome and useful compendium for ready reference, which is both scientific and thoroughgoing, setting forth not only the origins and main tenets of the various religions, but giving also a brief history of doctrine. In his study of religions Dr. Hopkins did not discover the great line of demarcation, which Prof. F. Max Mueller so clearly pointed out — the distinction between the one religion of faith and the many heterodox and man-made religions of work. He states that no "religion is altogether heterodox," p. 11, and his opinion of the religion of Christ and Christianity is that of a modernistic agnostic, who has failed to understand the essence of Christianity and refuses to acknowledge its superiority and divine sublimity. The chapter discussing "The Religion of Christ and Christianity," between which the author makes a distinction, is full of glaring mistakes, caused by the writer's apathetic and modernistic viewpoint, and mars the pleasure of perusing this in so many respects admirable book. MUELLER.

Sermons for Days We Observe. By *Frederick F. Shannon*, Minister of Central Church, Chicago. $1.50. (Geo. H. Doran Co., New York.)

Here we have a collection of sermons which were preached on New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Thanksgiving Day, etc. There are eleven addresses in all. One funeral address has been inserted. The reader will soon perceive that Dr. Shannon has fine literary gifts. The book does not cut a bad figure when considered as a collection of essays. But to call these productions sermons is like a dagger's thrust for our homiletic sensibilities. The Scripture-texts usually are there, but they are not duly explained and applied. Dr. Shannon is not a preacher of great doctrines or Bible-truths, but an interesting entertainer, who satisfies our craving for the esthetic. Such Scripture-truths as he does offer usually do not refer to the heart of Christianity, the great doctrines of sin and grace, but are of a subordinate nature found far away from the paths of controversy. A.

The Christ of the Indian Road. By *E. Stanley Jones.* $1.00. (The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati.)

The writer of this little volume is a Methodist missionary, who seems to have been remarkably successful in his work in India. What he insists on is that "Christ, not creeds, has to be preached to the heathen world if we wish to see it Christianized, and that Christians must be more saintly in their lives." The book is experiencing a tremendous sale, having run through eight editions since September, 1925. The title means,

"The Christ whom India needs and wants." Besides the author's antipathy to creeds, it is to be deplored that he does not sufficiently stress the work which Christ has done for us — objective redemption and justification. The book is not intended to give information on India, but may be considered a plea for presenting Christ, and not primarily Christian doctrine, to heathen people. To think that this distinction can be made is, of course, an illusion. A.

The Leaven of the Sadducees, or, Old and New Apostasies. By *Ernest Gordon.* 263 pages, 5¾×8. $1.50 net. (The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n, 843—845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

This book has been called "a modern classic against Modernism," and "the greatest broadside against Liberalism that has been put out in this generation." It is a fearless book, and skilfully written, in choice, vigorous language, which makes fascinating reading. It proves beyond contradiction that Modernism is nothing else but the rankest outgrowth of Unitarianism, which, coming to the front a century ago, has gradually swept over the Churches and is now choking Christianity. It is a book, not of mere statements, but of direct evidences, reports, and data which for the average pastor are hard to find. It is also a thoroughly modern and up-to-date book, dealing with men and events of the day, a work based upon careful study, painstaking research, and firm convictions. We recommend it without reservation to our pastors as one of the most instructive volumes on the subject of the rise of Liberalism in our country. The book bound in paper costs only $1.00. MUELLER.

The Daughter's Danger. By *Mrs. Emma F. A. Drake, M. D.* 50 pages. 25 cts. (The Vir Publishing Co., 200 N. Fifteenth St., Philadelphia, Pa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This little book is advertised as a "prize paper to girls of sixteen and upwards." It points out the untold dangers that threaten a young girl to-day and warns them most seriously in language, plain, but chaste, against the perils that lurk in hundreds of unexpected places, where least of all a girl of sixteen would be inclined to suspect them. We recommend this earnest appeal for the preservation of virginal purity to those who have children of the age of sixteen and upwards. It reveals little of the sex question. That is something which a mother herself must tell her daughter under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. MUELLER.

Hail to the New-born King! A Christmas service of Scripture-reading, recitation, and song for Sunday-schools. 32 pages. 60 cts. per dozen. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.)

It is still too hot to think of Christmas, but the heralds of the joyous Christ-festival, the Christmas programs for children, are reminding us that winter is coming. This new Christmas service has been practically arranged for both large and smaller Sunday-schools, allowing sufficient opportunity for the various classes to take part in the program, by song as well as by recitation. The entire program is dignified and solemn, as programs of this kind should be. MUELLER.